

Appl. No. 10/052,809  
Amdt. Dated Jan. 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 4, 2004

### **Remarks**

#### **Claim Objections**

Applicant has canceled claim 17 without prejudice, and amended, by following the Examiner's suggestions, the phrase "said means" to "said means for guiding" and "further guiding" to "further guides" in claim 19.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 1-4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In order to overcome the rejections, applicant has amended the phrase "the second channel assembly" to "a second channel assembly" in claim 1, so that clearly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Therefore, the rejections as they apply to claims 2-4 should be removed.

And applicant also has amended the claim 20 to depend from the claim 19 instead, so that clearly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lemoff et al. (US 6,198,864B1).

In response to these rejections, applicant has now amended claim 5 to include the limitation of original claim 6, and has canceled claim 6 in order to place the instant application in a condition for allowance, therefore claim 7 is also believed to be patentable and allowed, since they depend directly or indirectly depending from independent claim 5.

Appl. No. 10/052,809  
Amdt. Dated Jan. 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 4, 2004

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sivarajan et al. (US 5,233,453A).

In response to this rejection, applicant has now amended claim 14 to include the limitation of original claim 17, and has canceled claim 17 in order to place the instant application in a condition for allowance, therefore claims 15-16 are also believed to be patentable and allowed, since they depend directly or indirectly depending from independent claim 14.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

As stated above, applicants have amended claims 1 and 20 to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, and submit that claim 1-4 and 20 now are clearly claimed the invention.

Applicants have added the subject matters of claim 6 into independent claim 5, and cancelled claim 6 without prejudice. Amended independent claim 5 is submitted to be patentable, in accordance with the matters detailed by Examiner regarding claim 6 in the *Allowable Subject Matter* part of the Office Action.

Applicants have added the subject matters of claim 17 into independent claim 14. Independent claim 14 is submitted to be patentable in accordance with the matters detailed by Examiner regarding claim 17 in the *Allowable Subject Matter* part of the Office Action.

Accordingly, dependent claims 15-16 are also submitted to be allowable, since they all depend directly from independent claim 14.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/052,809  
Amtdt. Dated Jan. 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

David Li et al

By   
Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137